

Christine Cannizzo - Development Project at 529 S. Murphy St., Sunnyvale

From: "Mary Adams" <madams@theugroup.com>
To: <planning@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us>
Date: 6/28/2004 12:25 PM
Subject: Development Project at 529 S. Murphy St., Sunnyvale

ATTACHMENT 8
Page 1 of 2

Dear Planning Commission:

In regards to the development project at 529 S. Murphy Street, I am concerned about the giant redwood tree on the Southeast corner of 530 S. Frances Street. I would like to have the city arborist come prior to the project start date and make sure the roots won't be damaged from the new foundation work, hence making the tree a potential hazard.

I can be reached at (408) 736-6688. Thank you.

Jim Adams
530 S. Frances St.
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
(408) 736-6688
Email: madams@theugroup.com

Planning Commission meeting-28 June/04
(subject: 2004-0300 application)

A number of problems are evident with the proposal to subdivide the existing lot, to accommodate the building of a 1758 sq. ft. two-story, 3-bedroom house. For example;

1. Setbacks.

- (a) new house-- with the rear setback of only 10-ft., it encroaches into the rear yard 37.5%. The max allowable is 25% !
- (b) new house-- the min. front setback is 20-ft., however the garage portion of house is only 4-ft. from the new property line!
- (c) old house--the rear setback is only 14-ft.9-in. The requirement is 20-ft.!

2. Distance between buildings.

- (a) A min. of 20-ft. is required, however, the proposed distance is 18-ft.9-in!
Considering the front yard requirement, mentioned in 1(b) above, the min distance would be far greater.

3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

- (a) new house= 40.22% (40.66%, using pages 4 & 11 numbers).
 - (b) old house= 55.33% (55.58%, using pages 4 & 11 numbers).
- The max. value for a 2-story house is 40% !

These problems and the other deviations listed in the Staff report show a need to seriously question the validity of this application.

The majority of residential lots in the neighborhood are of similar size, and as such they can accommodate either an expansion of an existing home or the addition of a small "granny unit" on the lot. Such units are quite small, compared to the much larger 1,756 sq.ft., 3-bedroom house being proposed.

This is definitely the wrong location for this proposed project, it is therefore recommended that the Commission deny the entire application.

Charles Wallin